



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,440	02/05/2004	Michal Daniely	26003	3178
67801	7590	01/15/2010	EXAMINER	
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.			DUFFY, BRADLEY	
P.O. BOX 16446				
ARLINGTON, VA 22215			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/771,440	DANIELY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BRADLEY DUFFY	1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 72,73 and 82-92 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 72-73 and 82-92 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed October 7, 2009, is acknowledged. Claims 87-92 have been newly added.
2. Claims 72-73 and 82-92 are pending in the application and are now subject to the following additional requirement to restrict and elect species of the elected invention after consideration of newly added claims 87-92.

***Election/Restriction***

3. This application now contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the invention.

In this case, the invention is first generic to a plurality of species of invention, wherein said morphological abnormality is selected from: a) an enlarged nucleus, b) a high nucleus to cytoplasm (N/C) ratio, c) a considerable dark appearance of a cell or d) an irregular nuclear border as compared to a transitional epithelial cell with a normal morphology.

M.P.E.P. § 808.01(a) states: "If applicant presents species claims to more than one patentably distinct species of the invention after an Office action on only generic claims, with no restriction requirement, the Office may require the applicant to elect a single species for examination". See M.P.E.P. §§ 811.02 and 818.02(b).

The species of invention to which the generic claims are directed to are independent or distinct because claims to these different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. For example, each species or type of morphological abnormality recites a structurally and functionally distinct morphological abnormality, which can be separately determined. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record. Accordingly, a thorough search and consideration of the technical literature, and consideration of different non-

prior art issues would be particularly pertinent in this case. Therefore, the examination of claims directed to any one species requires unique searches and considerations that are not required for examination of claims directed to any other species and will not provide adequate information regarding any other. See MPEP § 809.

4. Therefore, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single morphological abnormality listed above, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

As described above, there is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

5. Additionally, the invention is generic to a plurality of species of invention, wherein said chromosomal abnormality is selected from: a) polyploidy of chromosome 3, b) polyploidy of chromosome 7, c) polyploidy of chromosome 17 and d) loss of the 9p21 locus.

The species of invention to which the generic claims are directed to are independent or distinct because claims to these different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. For example, each species or type of chromosomal abnormality recites a structurally and functionally distinct chromosomal abnormality, which can be separately determined. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record. Accordingly, a thorough search and consideration of the technical literature, and consideration of different non-prior art issues would be particularly pertinent in this case. Therefore, the examination

of claims directed to any one species requires unique searches and considerations that are not required for examination of claims directed to any other species and will not provide adequate information regarding any other. See MPEP § 809.

6. Therefore, Applicant is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single chromosomal abnormality listed above, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

As described above, there is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

7. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are

added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or *clearly* admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brad Duffy whose telephone number is (571) 272-9935. The examiner can normally be reached at Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM with alternate Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, can be reached at (571) 272-0832. The official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully,  
Brad Duffy

/Stephen L. Rawlings/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643

/bd/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1643  
January 12, 1010